

I now call upon Sri Gangabovi to make his statement. Hon'ble Member Sri Gangabovi is not here, though he was requested to be present after Tea interval, when I called him earlier also he was absent. It is not proper on the part of the Members to be absent when they are requested to be present, and come to the House at their sweet will and pleasure? As a matter of strict observance of discipline, I shall permit Sri Gangabovi to make his statement only tomorrow, not today.

Sri K. H. RANGANATH.—It would be better if the Hon'ble Deputy Minister for Home is also present tomorrow.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Hon'ble Deputy Minister for Home, Sri Manik Rao, will be also present tomorrow to make his statement on the subject.

I shall give my Ruling regarding the Notifications issued by the Minister for Development tomorrow. Day-after-tomorrow I shall give my Ruling regarding the Adjournment Motion given notice of by Hon'ble members, Sriyuths T. R. Shamanna, Vatal Nagaraj and M. S. Krishnan. And, regarding the matter now discussed, I shall give my Ruling either on Monday or Tuesday. With this I go to the next item on the Agenda.

Sri AZIZ SAIT.—Sir, I had given a charge-sheet against the Minister through the Speaker to the then Chief Minister, Sri S. Nijalingappa, in his capacity as the Leader of the House. At that time, the Deputy Speaker Sri D. Manjunath was in the Chair. I want to know what has happened to it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I shall find out the position.

MYSORE LEGISLATURE SALARIES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1968

Motion to Consider

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Mysore Legislature Salaries (Amendment) Bill, 1968 may be taken up first and the Mysore Ministers Salaries and Allowances (Amendment) Bill, 1968, may be taken up tomorrow.

I request the Hon'ble Minister for Parliamentary Affairs to move the Bill.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY (Minister for Labour).—Sir, I beg to move :

“That the Mysore Legislature Salaries (Amendment) Bill, 1968, be taken into consideration.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

“That the Mysore Legislature Salaries (Amendment) Bill, 1968, be taken into consideration.”

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Sir, according to the existing Act no provision is made for payment of salaries or emoluments to the Deputy Speaker when he functions as Speaker. Similarly, no provision is made

(SRI K. PUTTASWAMY)

for payment of salary and other emoluments to the Deputy Chairman when he functions as Chairman. The House is well aware that sometimes vacancy occurs unfortunately and the Deputy Speaker is called upon to function as Speaker. It happened very recently with reference to this House. Sir, in the Upper House also the same thing is repeated. Whenever the Chairman retires invariably there will be a vacancy and the Deputy Chairman if he continues to be a Member he will be functioning as the Chairman. Under those circumstances, it was considered necessary that the Deputy Speaker or the Deputy Chairman should be paid the same salary and allowances for the period during which he functions in the office of either the Speaker or the Chairman. So amendment has to be moved for the 1956 Act to make such provisions. Sir, under the present Act, sumptuary allowance is paid to the Speaker as well as to the Chairman. The provision made in the Act is for payment of Rs. 2,000 sumptuary allowance to the Hon'ble Chairman and Rs. 3,500 to the Hon'ble Speaker. It was considered that the amount was not adequate. The Hon'ble members are aware there is a difference in the strength of this House and that House. There are 63 members in that House and 216 members in this House and we are all recipients of the hospitality of the Hon'ble Chairman and Hon'ble Speaker. It was found that a provision of Rs. 3,500 for the Hon'ble Speaker and a provision of Rs. 2,000 for the Hon'ble Chairman was not sufficient. Now the amendments are brought here to enhance the sumptuary allowance of both the Presiding Officers—Rs. 6,500 to the Hon'ble Speaker and Rs. 3,500 for the Hon'ble Chairman.

Sometimes in discharging the duties attached to the office of the Speaker and Chairman, there may be occasions where the Hon'ble Speaker and the Hon'ble Chairman have to break their journey by road and thereafter proceed by train or by plane. In this circumstance, the car will have to come back to Bangalore and therefore a provision is made for payment of petrol charges for the car to come back to Bangalore from the point where the Hon'ble Speaker or the Hon'ble Chairman have taken to other modes of travelling.

Sir, there is one other provision here. We have taken occasion to give certain facilities and to make provision thereof to the Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition. You are all well aware how anxious we are to see that there is an organised opposition functioning effectively on the floor of the House. My friends on the other side will bear out that all efforts and attempts are made from this side to feel that cordial relationship is cultivated. Sir, it is a well known fact that democracy can function successfully and effectively only when the opposition function effectively with alertness. We on this side are shouldering the heavy responsibility of running the administration of this country. There are so many problems to be tackled every day. We are trying to tackle the problems in the way in which we can do. It is quite possible that

we commit some mistakes. As a result of discussion on the floor of this House, and in some other forums we may change our course of action. It is always advantageous to have discussions on all such problems. With this anxiety I had discussion with the opposition as well as with some other members on this side. We all feel that it would be better under the circumstances to make a request to the Hon'ble Speaker to appoint a Committee to go into the entire question and not to take up this question now itself which would serve no purpose. All the Hon'ble members of this House should be well informed as to what is the practice prevailing elsewhere in other Commonwealth Countries, in our Lok Sabha and in other Legislatures of the Union. With that end in view we had unanimously made a request to you through a resolution to appoint a Committee. I am sure you will be appointing a Committee consisting of very experienced members of this House. It would be able to go through the entire conventions and practice and then they will be able to submit a very valuable report on which action may have to be taken. I am sure when we are able to have that report and after discussing that report dispassionately, the House will be able to come to a proper decision. After I introduced the Bill, I had occasion to go through some of the literature. I do not claim I made a thorough study. We made a request to you to appoint a committee. I have got the highest respect for the Leader of the Opposition and other members. Never on any occasion we have treated them very lightly or whenever they make statements we never take them very lightly. We earnestly hear what they say. This administration can be run to the best advantage of the people only when the Ruling Party and the Opposition Party are able to function in a very cordial atmosphere. There is room for difference of opinion. I do not expect that the members of the Opposition share the same views of this side on any particular problem. Therefore with that anxiety I was trying to contact certain members of the House. I wish I was able to contact every one of the members of the House. But the members will also see that serious limitation of time is also there; otherwise I would have approached every Hon'ble Member of this House and explained to him what was in my mind. We have tried to make provisions in the Bill, for providing certain facilities to the Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition. Yesterday I moved for the appointment of a Committee to go into this question. I therefore request the Hon'ble House to kindly drop the provision relating to the Leader of the Opposition and pass the rest of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—How can it be done ?

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—It is a negative amendment. I am taking the House into confidence in regard to this matter of the Leader of the Opposition so that there cannot be any misgivings in the mind of any Hon'ble Member of this House. I therefore request this House to kindly drop it. If the Hon'ble Speaker puts this to vote, unfortunately I will be pushed to the embarrassing position of voting against the motion.

5-30 P.M.

†Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Sir, I heard with rapt attention, the arguments advanced by the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs with regard to the several provisions of this Bill. I have no quarrel with regard to the provisions running up to section 5, *i.e.*, those relating to the sumptuary allowances to the Chairman and the Speaker. Those are all probably in consonance with the privileges that are enjoined in other countries. That apart, with regard to the Deputy Chairman and the Deputy Speaker we were also feeling that a provision of this kind was very necessary,—particularly, on the occasion, when our late lamented Speaker Mr. Baliga fell ill and the Deputy Speaker discharged his duties to the satisfaction of everybody on that side and this side. Therefore I have no quarrel about that provision also.

But what intrigues me is about the new provision with regard to clause 6. I have got a lot to talk about it. But I fail to understand why, without much pre-meditation or thought, this clause was brought. I do not question his motive at this stage. Because it is said that with the best of intentions it has been brought. But there are precedents as to how it ought to be and what it ought to be. There are various countries especially in the Commonwealth which provides you guidance in this respect. What is meant by an opposition party? What does the British Parliament teach us with regard to that? Was there two-party system at all times or were there multi-parties in England? What is the position in Australia, New-Zealand and various other States? That is a matter which is very interesting to read. Especially in a country like India,—barring perhaps Madras where there is a single party that is now ruling and even there, there are other parties, but they are not in such numerical strength, there is no single opposition party existing anywhere else. But in times to come, these multi-parties are bound to go. It is a very complicated problem. We, in our own way, in Mysore, were trying to evolve ourselves into a sort of federal unit, in spite of the multiplicity our parties like the Swatantra party, the P.S.P., the S.S.P. They are all recognised parties on an all-India basis, and we have also the Janata Party to which I have the honour to belong.

Therefore, what I want to say is, that these are all matters which should be looked into and in my humble opinion, the Government before they brought a clause like clause 6 should have taken the opposition into confidence and decided how it should be and in what manner it ought to be.

So far as India is concerned, there are only two precedents as such. One in West Bengal where they have provided for paying Salary to the Leader of the Opposition. There is some other provision in Rajasthan, if I am correct. These are the two States where there is some provision. Of course in England there is such a provision. But in India, our Parliament has not made any such provision. Therefore I am quite anxious that whatever we do must be with the single purpose of having

well-knit parties and with that object in view, this is a matter that has to be studied and examined and then a formula to be evolved satisfactorily to all concerned. Therefore the suggestion made by the Hon'ble Minister yesterday moving the resolution giving power to the Hon'ble Speaker, to me at any rate, is agreeable, because this will provide an opportunity for us in this House to sit together, examine and come to some agreed solution. Therefore, with that object in view I feel the Hon'ble Minister has done well in not taking clause 6 into consideration but he does not know what he should do with it now having moved it and having put it before this House. Probably he is not in a position to say 'no' to his own proposition. Let him not think on the technicalities of it. I do not want him to side-track it. Now that you have put it, I want that the Leader of the Opposition, his position, dignity, status and honour should never be less than that of a Cabinet Minister, because it is stated that His Majesty's opposition in England means an alternative Government. Let the Congressmen not think that they are going to rule this country for ever; it is high time that they should also think of shouldering the responsibility with us instead of trying to keep us away.

Now if we look at what has happened today on the discussion that took place—of course I am of a different opinion and I do not want to express about it—we are touchy on this side as far as it touches our self-respect and honour.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Your self-respect is our self-respect.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Thank you very much. Therefore, I personally feel that this clause 6, may not be taken into consideration, provided an assurance is given by the Hon'ble Minister that he will take it at the earliest when we meet next and evolve a formula or thrash out our differences and come to some understanding and see, if necessary, a separate Bill is introduced. With these suggestions, I support this measure.

† **Sri S. S. SHETTAR (Hubli).**—The provision made in this Act regarding paying the Deputy Speaker a higher salary when he discharged the duties of the Speaker is more or less to be viewed as a policy matter. The Deputy Speaker will have to discharge his duty as Deputy Speaker and he was to act as Speaker and take charge of the office of the Speaker because there was no Speaker. Sir, this does not mean that he has discharged in any way more onerous duty or more difficult job. Because the Speaker was not there, he had to fill up the gap, he had to perform the duty of the Speaker. If the same analogy is to be extended, perhaps the Chairman who was appointed at the opening of the Session has also discharged the same duty. But that does not mean that his salary should be taken to such a level. What I beg to impress is, that if at all he has discharged, he has discharged his duty as Deputy Speaker and he has, as Deputy Speaker, filled the temporary vacancy that was created. So, there is no sense in saying that he should be paid a higher

(SRI S. S. SHET TAR)

salary. It only means that he is also a Government employee who could claim increased salary because he has discharged a higher responsibility. I am not prepared to reduce the position of the Deputy Speaker or Speaker to such a level. When he has discharged that duty, he should be deemed to have discharged the duty as Deputy Speaker only.

Regarding the payment of certain allowances, petrol charges, etc. it is a very minor matter.

Clause 6 is more or less to be viewed as a policy matter. No doubt the concept of the Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition has to be developed in a proper manner. The circumstances in India, more or less, in Mysore State are not similar to those that are existing in other countries. We have to see, apart from the feeling that the opposition has to be nurtured and supported, properly, here there are numerous parties—political parties, functioning in our State and they are not placed on an equal footing. We have to create equal opportunity for one and all political parties which are functioning as opposition Parties in this Legislature. I do not mean to say that a particular party which is commanding majority, should be deprived of its rights which is proposed under section 6. What I propose is, that similar, equal opportunities should not be denied to some members of a party because they happen to be less in number. They have their own ideology and their sincerity about it cannot be doubted. In building up the opposition, even one particular party which has got an all-India status should not be denied its due.

SRI K. H. PATIL.—That portion of the Bill is going to be referred to the Committee. It is better we do not touch that provision on the floor of the House.

MR. SPEAKER.—Clause 6 will be omitted and so the Hon'ble Member may not refer to it in great detail now. He may discuss it afterwards when the consideration of clauses comes before the House in due course.

SRI S. S. SHET TAR.—Your suggestion is, we have to accept the half-hearted approach of the Government.

MR. SPEAKER.—Now the Government say that the matter may be dealt with by a committee and then suitable proposals in relation to this particular matter formulated. So there is no question of half-hearted approach. Hon'ble Member may be brief.

SRI S. S. SHET TAR.—Only that section should be deferred at this stage and referred to the Committee; whether one part of a Bill should be passed and one part of it can be referred to a committee is another question. How is that committee to be appointed under the Rules of Procedure if the sense of the House is that it should be referred to a committee, and whether that is to be a select committee?

Sri K. H. RANGANATH.—After the whole House yesterday accepted the motion that was moved by the Hon'ble Minister, the Speaker constitutes the Committee. Therefore we have entrusted that responsibility to the Speaker. It is not good to say now that the House can again express itself on that matter.

Sri S. S. SHETTAR.—Whether it is good or bad, I have to express my opinion. I feel it is a reasonable opinion. We have to discharge our responsibilities. I do not feel that we should deviate from the Rules of Procedure to consider any subject; I do not know how there are any peculiar circumstances about it. It should be treated just like any other Bill.

Sri K. H. RANGANATH.—You were a party to it yesterday.

Sri S. S. SHETTAR.—What I propose is that this Bill should be referred to a Select Committee just as any other Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That can be done only after the motion that the Bill be taken into consideration is passed under Rule 74. There will have to be a formal motion mentioning names of the Members of the Select Committee.

Sri S. S. SHETTAR.—You may consider it at that stage only.

Sri V. N. PATIL.—Sir, while offering my comments on the Mysore Legislature Salaries (Amendment) Bill, 1968, in regard to clauses pertaining to the Chairman, Deputy Chairman, and Speaker and Deputy Speaker, I want to say that there cannot be any controversy as the Hon'ble Minister said, we are beneficiaries of the hospitality of the Chair often. I know that we have to see that the position held by a particular individual is to the maximum possible extent utilised in a dignified manner and to see that particular individual is not put to any out-of-pocket expense. These are facilities given by the Government and we welcome it.

About clause 6, much has been already said that there is no need to discuss this issue just now. I cannot remain without commenting or giving my own opinion about it. The Ruling Party Sir, have cleverly tried to create a rift in the Opposition party itself—I am deliberately using the word RIFT because by inserting a clause like clause 6 conferring certain facilities to the Leader of the Opposition, the party in power is trying to widen the gulf by recognizing a member of this House as leader of the opposition, who happens to be the leader of that opposition which has got a majority second to the ruling party, and thus they want to create a fait accompli that the leader of the opposition will be one who is recognised by the Government and who belongs to the 2nd majority party in the House. This will lead to unhealthy division in the opposition, and I am sure none from our side will be lured by this unwholy trap being laid by the Congress ruling party. The question comes as to who should be recognised as the Leader of the Opposition. In India today we are facing the present tide on account of the creation of Congressmen themselves by their nepotism and corrupt methods and people have begun

(SRI V. N. PATIL)

to disbelieve them, and resultantly in several States Opposition parties have come to power. In this House Sri Sivappa has been accepted as the Leader of the Opposition by us because we have got to have a proper person to guide us and to lead us; he may be from P.S.P. or from any other party. But this clause 6 is brought with a purpose and that is to create rift among the opposition parties. Today Sri Sivappa is considered as our leader though he is the leader of the P.S.P. because it is on account of the voluntary election we have made. But if you take the numerical strength of one party and say that the leader of that party is the Leader of the Opposition, it would be nothing but trying to create a rift among ourselves, and we will not permit you to dictate us as to who should be leader of the combined opposition whether a P. S. P or a Communist or a Janatha Party man. It is our discretion. I am sorry, we can be a party to such a legislation of finding a blacksheep or hiring one with a prior motive.

†Sri M. NAGAPPA.—Sir, I do not want to oppose the other provisions of the Bill except one thing. Now the hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs said that he is not moving clause 6.

Mr. SPEAKER.—No; he has got to move it and I have to put it to the House.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—I have got another suggestion before it is put. Once the Bill has been introduced, it is for consideration and the Bill has also been put for consideration and we are now at that stage of consideration. Now we have constituted a committee. We are in an anomalous position whether we should consider this question or the hon. Minister should withdraw it or what is the position of clause 6? If it is withdrawn, there is again an anomalous position that it will be in the hands of the Treasury Bench and they may bring it again or not bring it. They may or may not bring another Bill. They may suppress. I refer to rule 87 wherein the Hon. Speaker has got a right to postpone the consideration of a particular clause for a certain period till the report is received by the House from the Committee and after that, that can be taken into consideration. So, I submit, instead of withdrawing the particular clause from the Bill, the clause may be postponed for a certain period till the Committee named by the Speaker submits its report. I do not want the hon. Minister to withdraw it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I understand that.

†Sri B. P. GANGADHAR (Tumkur).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I support the view taken by Sri Nagappa in the matter. When this matter is going to be referred to a Committee, till the Committee takes a decision in the matter and submits its report to the House, this clause may be postponed rather than being withdrawn. It is within your power to do so.

Regarding the salaries of the Deputy Speaker and the Deputy Chairman, they are there to officiate for the Speaker or the Chairman as the case may be. So, the very purpose of creating these two posts of Deputy Speaker and Deputy Chairman is to perform the work and duties of the Speaker or the Chairman at the time the Speaker or the Chairman is unable to function.

6-00 P.M.

So, when a post of the Deputy Speaker and Deputy Chairman is created only for that purpose, there is no fun in saying that he will be doing a particular duty at a particular time and he must be paid money. To say that he must be paid the salary of the Speaker does not stand to reason because he will be doing the duty which the Constitution enjoins him to do. Merely because he is functioning for a particular day—it may be a day or a couple of days it does not amount to saying that he will be entitled to the salary of the Speaker. That means we will be having two Speakers at a time. It may be a case where the Speaker of a House duly elected, may not be in a position to function for the reason of his health or he may be abroad, and just then the Deputy Speaker will carry on the work of the Speaker. Does it mean that during that period the Speaker will not be the Speaker at all? Even during that period he will continue to be the Speaker even though he cannot come to the House and carry on the work.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—The Bill says when there is a vacancy. The word 'vacancy' is used.

Sri B. P. GANGADHAR.—Supposing there is the demise of a Speaker or a Speaker is removed. During that period, it is a contingent matter and he has to function only as a Deputy Speaker and carry on the work of the Speaker and that is what the Constitution says.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Constitution says that when there is a vacancy in the office of Speaker for whatever reason, the Deputy Speaker has to act as the Speaker. Of course it is for the House to accept or reject it. The question before the House is, during that period when he acts as Speaker whether the salary and other facilities of the Speaker should be extended to him. That may be considered.

Sri B. P. GANGADHAR.—What I am submitting is, he will be working for and on behalf of the Speaker and for that purpose he is appointed. Of course I do not want to come in the way of any of my friend getting it. What I wish to say is that such a contingency may not be made a burden on the State.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಹುಚ್ಚಮಾಸ್ತಿಗೌಡ (ಹುಲಿಯೂರುದುರ್ಗ).— ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ನಮ್ಮ ಸುಂದರವಾದ ಮನೂದಾ ಕಾನೂನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಭಾಗವನ್ನು ನಾವು ಒಟ್ಟಡಾನ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಬೇರೆ ಮಾರ್ಗವಿಲ್ಲ. ನಿನ್ನೆ ಕಾನನ್ ಒಂದು ಸಮಿತಿಮಾಡಿ ಯೋಚಿಸಿ ಮುಂದೆ ಮನೂದಾ ಕಾನೂ ನ್ನು ತರಬೇಕೆಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನಮಾಡಿರುವುದನ್ನೇ ಈಗ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರುದ್ಧವಾಗಿ ಒಟ್ಟ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಶ್ರೀ ನಾಗಪ್ಪನವರು ಕ್ಲೇದಕಾಗೆ ಒಂದು ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಕನ್ಸಿಡರೇಷನ್ ಸ್ಪೀಷಲ್ ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಪೋಸ್ಟ್ ಪೋನ್ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದೆಂದು

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಹುಡ್ಡೆಮಾಸ್ತಿಗೌಡ)

ಭಾವಿಸಿದರೆ ಉಳಿದ ಭಾಗ ಪಾಸಾಗುವ ಅವಕಾಶ ತಪ್ಪಿಹೋಗುವುದು. ಆದುದರಿಂದ 97ನೆಯ ಕ್ಲಾಜಿನ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ವಿತ್‌ಡ್ರಾ ಮಾಡಿ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಸಮಿತಿಯು ಒಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಮೇಲೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಿ ಒಟ್ಟು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತ, ಈಗ ಒಂದು ಭಾಗ ಒಪ್ಪಾಡೌನ್ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತವಲ್ಲ ಮತ್ತು ನಾಗಪ್ಪನವರು ಹೇಳಿದಹಾಗೆ ಒಂದನ್ನು ಪೋಸ್ಟ್‌ಪೋನ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಉಳಿದ ಭಾಗ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಉಳಿದಿರುವುದು ಒಂದೇ ಮಾರ್ಗ. ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ವಿತ್‌ಡ್ರಾ ಮಾಡಿ ಎಲ್ಲವೂ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವಾದಮೇಲೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತ.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಎನ್. ಕೃಷ್ಣನ್ (ಮರ್ರೇಶ್ವರಂ).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭಾಪತಿಗಳೇ, ಎರಡು ಮೂರು ಅಂಶಗಳ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಮೊದಲನೆಯದು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಹುಡ್ಡೆಮಾಸ್ತಿಗೌಡರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಈ ಮನೋದಯನ್ನು ವಾಪಸು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತ, ನ್ಯಾಯವಾದುದು. ಇದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಆಳುವ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಮೂವ್ ಮಾಡಿದವರು ಅಮೇರಿ ಒಂದು ಕ್ಲಾಜನ್ನು ಕನ್‌ಸಿಡರ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಅರ್ಥ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಅರ್ಥ ಬಿಡುವುದು ತಕರಾರಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ವಾಪಸು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಕೂಲಂಕಷವಾಗಿ ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡಿ ಸರಿಯಾದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಂದಮೇಲೆ ಕನ್‌ಸಿಡರ್ ಮಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತ.

ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ವಿಷಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಮತ್ತು ಸಭಾಪತಿಯವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಪಚ್ಚಾಯರಿ ಅರೋಯನ್ಸ್ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಅವರ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಗೌರವವಿದೆ, ಅವರಿಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದ ಅನುಕೂಲಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು, ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಇತರರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಳ ಕಡಮೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು, ಅಸ್ತರಿಟಿ ಪ್ರಾಕ್ಟೀಸ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವವರು ಈಗ ಸ್ವೀಕರ ಮತ್ತು ಥೇರ್‌ಮನ್ ಈ ಇಬ್ಬರಿಗೂ ಅರೋಯನ್ಸ್ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಮೊದಲು ಅಸ್ತರಿಟಿ ಪ್ರಾಕ್ಟೀಸ್ ಮಾಡಿ ನಂತರ ಇನ್ನೊಬ್ಬರಿಗೆ ಹೇಳಬೇಕು. ಅವರು ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತರಬಾರದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸ್ವೀಕರಕ್ಕೆ ಮತ್ತು ಥೇರ್‌ಮನ್‌ರವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಪ್ಲಯರಿ ಅರೋಯನ್ಸ್ ಕೊಡಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಅವರಾಗಿಯೇ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತರದಿದ್ದರೆ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಈಗ ಇಷ್ಟತ್ತೆಂಟು ಜನ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಕೆಲವರನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಒಂದು ಕಡೆ ಆಳುವ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಇದೆ, ಆಹಾರ ಪದಾರ್ಥಗಳು ಸಿಕ್ಕುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಕಡೆ ಅರೋಯನ್ಸ್ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ಸಿನವರು ಪ್ರಾಕ್ಟೀಸ್ ಮಾಡುವುದೇ ಬೇರೆ. ಅವರ ಪ್ರೀಟಿಂಗ್ ಬೇರೆ. ಇದು ನ್ಯಾಯವಲ್ಲ. ಇದನ್ನು ಗಮನಿಸಿ ಅವರ ತತ್ವದ ಪ್ರಕಾರವಾದರೂ ಬೇರೆ ರೀತಿಯ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತರಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಎ. ಎನ್. ಪಾಟೀಲರು ತಮಗೂ ಅರೋಯನ್ಸ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು, ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವುದನ್ನು ನಾನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅವರು ಕಳೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ತಯಾರಿದ್ದರೆ ನಾನೂ ತಯಾರಾಗಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರೀಚ್ ಮಾಡುವವರು ಪ್ರಾಕ್ಟೀಸ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ತಯಾರಿರಬೇಕು. ಹೇಳುವುದೊಂದು, ಮಾಡುವುದೊಂದು, ಇದು ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ಸಿನ ನೀತಿಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ.

ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ವಿಷಯ, ವಿತ್‌ಡ್ರಾ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಬೇಕಿಲ್ಲ. ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರಿಗೆ ಏನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ವಿಚಾರಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದು ಪಕ್ಷ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಗೌರವ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಏಕೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು? ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರನ್ನು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಟ್ರೀಟ್ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಬ್ರಿಟನ್ನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವರೀತಿ ಟ್ರೀಟ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿ, ಅನೇಕ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅದನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸುತ್ತೀರಿ.

ಈಗ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶಿವಪ್ಪನವರು ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಾಳೆ ಬೇರೆಯವರು ಆ ಜಾಗಕ್ಕೆ ಬರಬಹುದು. ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರಿಗೆ ಏನು ಗೌರವ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು, ಅವರಿಗೆ ಏನೇನು ಸೌಲಭ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು, ಅದರೊಳಗೂ ಸೌಜನ್ಯ ತೋರಿಸಿಲ್ಲ. ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಒಗ್ಗಟ್ಟನ್ನು ಮುರಿಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ, ಇದು ಅನ್ಯಾಯ, ದುರುದ್ದೇಶಪೂರಿತವಾದುದು. ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿ ಇದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರಿಗೆ ಮರಾಠೆ ಕೊಡದೆ ಹೋದರೆ, ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಒಗ್ಗಟ್ಟನ್ನು ಮುರಿಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ

ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡಬಾರದು. ಸಂಯುಕ್ತ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷ ಎಂದು ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆ ಪಕ್ಷಗಳು ನೇರಕೊಂಡು ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿವೆ ಯಾರನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆನ್ನುವುದು ನಮಗೆ ಬಿಟ್ಟದ್ದು ಮನೋದಯಿಲ್ಲ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಡೆಫಿನಿಷನ್ ನಾವು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದನ್ನು ಅರಬ್ಬಿ ಸಮುದ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಕಿದರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು.

ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಅಫ್ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ 12ರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ಕ್ಯಾರಿಕ್ಯಾಚರ್ ಬೇಕು. ಡೆಲ್ಟಾಯಿಲ್ಲ ಮೈಸೂರು ಭವನದಲ್ಲಿ ಶಾಸಕರಾದವರು ಉಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಾಗ ಬೇರೆಯವರು ಹೇಗೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೋ ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಹೋದ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಚಾರ್ಜ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೋ ಅದೇ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಶಾಸಕರಿಗೂ ಚಾರ್ಜ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಯೇ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಶಾಸಕರಿಗೆ ಚಾರ್ಜ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸೇಳಿಲ್ಲ. ದಿ ಸ್ಟೇಟ್ ಗವರ್ನಮೆಂಟ್ ಮೇ ಡಿಟರ್ಮಿನ್ ಫ್ರಂ ಚೈಂಟ್ ಚೈಂ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಶಾಸಕರಿಗೆ ಏನಾದರೂ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ದರಗಳನ್ನು ಗೊತ್ತು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೋ ಏನೋ ಎನ್ನುವ ಸಂಶಯ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆ ತರಹ ತಾರತಮ್ಯ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ, ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಯಾವರೀತಿ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೋ ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ಶಾಸಕರೂ ಕೊಡುವಂತೆ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಮಾತ್ರ ಹೇಳಿ ನಾನು ಈ ಮನೋದಯವನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಚ್. ಪಾಟೀಲ್.—ಸನ್ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭಾಪತಿಗಳೇ, ಮೈಸೂರು ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟ್ರೇಷನ್ ಸ್ಯಾಲರಿಸ್ ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ನಾನು ಸ್ವಾಗತ ಮಾಡುತ್ತ ಕೆಲವೊಂದು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್ ಮತ್ತು ಚೇರ್ಮನ್ ಅವರ ಪಗಾರವನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಸುತ್ತ. ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಏನೇ ಇರಲಿ, ಸಭೆಯ ಗೌರವವನ್ನು ಕಾಯುವ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗಿಂತಲೂ ಅಧಿಕ ಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿರಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತಂದಿರುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ನಾನು ಸರ್ಕಾರವನ್ನು ಅಭಿನಂದಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಡೆಪ್ಯುಟಿ ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್ ಸಹ ಪ್ರತಿ ದಿವಸ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷತೆ ವಹಿಸಲು ಕೂಡಿರಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅವರು ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್‌ಗಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕಾಲ ಕುಳಿತಿರಬೇಕಾಗಬಹುದು. ನಾನು ಹೀಗೆ ಹೇಳುವಾಗ ತಪ್ಪು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆಂದು ಭಾವಿಸಬಾರದು. ನಮ್ಮ ಹಿರಿಯರಾದ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ವ್ಯವಹಾರಗಳ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಸಮಯಪೂರ್ವಕವಾದ ಬೆನ್ನಹ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈಗ ತಂದಿರುವ ಮನೋದಯಿಲ್ಲ ಅದನ್ನು ಅಡಕ ಮಾಡಬೇ ಇದ್ದರೂ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಮನೋದಯವನ್ನು ತಂದು ಡೆಪ್ಯುಟಿ ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್‌ಗೆ ಸಹ ಯಾವ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಿಂತಲೂ ಕಡಮೆ ಇರಬಾರದೆಂತ ಪಗಾರ ಕೊಡುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಈಗ ಡೆಪ್ಯುಟಿ ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಡೆಪ್ಯುಟಿ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗೆ ಹೊಂದಿಸುವ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಡೆಪ್ಯುಟಿ ಸ್ಪೀಕರಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ದರ್ಜೆ ಮತ್ತು ಸ್ಥಾನವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಅವರಿಗೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಪಗಾರ ಮತ್ತು ಸ್ಥಾನ ಇರುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ನಿರ್ವೇದನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಸಮಾಜುಯರಿ ಆರೋಯನ್ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಲು ಕೇಳಿರುವುದು ನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆ ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳ ಮತ್ತು ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರಗಳ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳು ಬಂದಾಗ ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್ ಅಥವಾ ಚೇರ್ಮನ್ ಆದವರನ್ನು ಅವರನ್ನು ಟ್ರೀಟ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು, ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಗೌರವವನ್ನು ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಗೌರವವನ್ನು ಕಾಯ್ದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಈ ಬಾಬಿಗೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಹಣ ವಿನಿಯೋಗವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎನ್ನುವ ಭಾವನೆಯಿಂದ, ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಕಂಜೂಷ್ ಆಗುವುದು ಬೇಡ ಎನ್ನುವ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ಸಹ ಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಅನುಮೋದಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಡೆಲ್ಟಾಯಿಲ್ಲದ ಮೈಸೂರು ಭವನದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕಾಲಕಾಲಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊರಡಿಸುವ ನೋಟಿಫಿಕೇಷನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ದೊರೆಯಬಹುದಾದ ರೇಟುಗಳು ಅನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗುತ್ತವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದು ಸಮಂಜಸವಾದುದಲ್ಲ. ಇಂಥ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ತನ್ನ ಕೈಯಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಆಗಾಗ್ಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕಡಮೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಯಾವ ವಿವೇಚನೆಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೂ ಭೂಷಣವಲ್ಲ. ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಸೌಲಭ್ಯಗಳು ಸಿಕ್ಕುತ್ತವೆಯೋ, ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಕೆಲಸಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ, ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಕೆಲಸಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ ಹೋದಾಗ ಯಾವ ಸೌಲಭ್ಯಗಳು ಸಿಕ್ಕುತ್ತವೆಯೋ ಅದೇ ಸೌಲಭ್ಯಗಳು ಎಲ್ಲ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೂ ಸಿಕ್ಕಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವ ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾದ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಕಾನೂನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಕದೆ ಇದ್ದರೂ ಗವರ್ನಮೆಂಟ್ ಆರ್ಡರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅದನ್ನು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ನಮೂದಿಸಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅನೇಕ ಪ್ರವಾಸಿ ಮಂದಿರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೇ ಬೇರೆ,

(ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಚ್. ಪಾಟೀಲ್)

ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಬೇರೆ ದೃಗ್ಗಳನ್ನು ವಿಧಿಸುವ ದುರದೃಷ್ಟವಾದ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಇದೆ. ಮೈಸೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಐ. ಎ. ಎಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಹೋದಾಗ ಅವರು ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಭತ್ಯೆ ಪಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೂ ಊಟ ಮಾಡಲು ಒಂದೂವರೆ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಸದಸ್ಯರಾದವರಿಗೆ ಮೂರು ರೂಪಾಯಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಏಕೆ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಯೆಂದು ತಿಳಿದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದನ್ನು ಬುದ್ಧಿ ಪೂರ್ವಕವಾಗಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ ಅಥವಾ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಇಬ್ಬದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಣ್ಣು ಮುಚ್ಚಿ ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡುವ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲವಾಗಿದೆಯೇ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ತಿಳಿಯದಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ತಿದ್ದಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು.

ಕ್ಯಾಬ್ ಅರರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಕೆಲವು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಹೇಳಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಅನುಮೋದಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರು, ಅವರ ಸ್ಥಾನಮಾನ, ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದ ಸೌಲಭ್ಯಗಳು ಈ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಿನ್ನೆಯ ದಿನ ಒಂದು ಸಮಿತಿಯನ್ನು ರಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಅರನೇ ಕ್ಯಾಬ್ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ವಿಚಾರ ಹೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಭಾವಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈಗ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರಾಗಿರುವ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶಿವಪ್ಪನವರು ನನಗೆ ಪಗಾರ ಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಬಹಳ ದಿವಸಗಳಿಂದ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರಾದವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದ ಸ್ಥಾನಮಾನಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸುವಾಗ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾಗಿ ಯಾರೇ ಇರಲಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಗೌರವಗಳಿಗೆ, ಅವರಿಗೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಸೌಕರ್ಯಗಳಿಗೆ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಿಂದಲೂ ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರಾದವರಿಗೆ ಕಡಮೆಯಾಗದಾರದೆಂದು ನಾನು ಬಲವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರತಿಪಾದನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈಗ ಆ ವಿಷಯ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರು ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಮೀಸಲಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಹಾಗೆ ಇಡೀ ರಾಜ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಮೀಸಲಾಗಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎನ್ನುವ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಆರೋಪಿಸುವುದು ಬೇಕು. ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರಿಗೆ ಸೌಕರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವಾಗ ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕವಾಗಿ ಅಪ್ರೋಪರೇಟ್ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟೇರಿಯಟ್ ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ನಾರ್ಕರು ಜನ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಲು ಅನುಕೂಲ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಸಲಹೆ ಮಾಡಿ ನನಗೆ ಇಷ್ಟು ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಸಮಯ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿಗೆ ವಂದಿಸಿ ನನ್ನ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

SRI S. S. SHETTAR.—I may be permitted to bring to your kind notice two articles of the Constitution, namely, articles 180 and 186. Article 180 reads like this :

“(1) While the office of Speaker is vacant, the duties of the office shall be performed by the Deputy Speaker or, if the office of Deputy Speaker is also vacant, by such member of the Assembly as the Governor may appoint for the purpose.

(2) During the absence of the Speaker from any sitting of the Assembly the Deputy Speaker or, if he is also absent, such person as may be determined by the rules of procedure of the Assembly, or, if no such person is present, such other person as may be determined by the Assembly, shall act as Speaker.”

Article 180 says that the Governor shall have to appoint the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker. These two offices are separate and distinct for the purpose of office only, but for the purpose of function when the Speaker is absent the Deputy Speaker can assume all those powers.

But for the purpose of payment of salary, it is governed by the provisions of article 186. Sir, I invite your attention to article 186 which deals with salaries and allowances of the Speaker and Deputy

Speaker and the Chairman and the Deputy Chairman. In the absence of the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker can discharge the duties of the Speaker and unless the Governor appoints him, he cannot draw the same salary.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is it a point of order?

Sri S. S. SHETTAR.—It is not a point of order; I only want to bring this to the Chair's notice.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have taken note of it. The consideration stage is over and I shall put it to the House. The question is:

“That the Mysore Legislature Salaries (Amendment) Bill, 1968 be taken into consideration.”

The motion was adopted.

Sri S. S. SHETTAR.—Sir, I have sent a motion to refer this Bill to a Select Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have seen it. It should be in proper form. The members of the Select Committee should be mentioned in it. In the absence of it, how can it be admitted?

Sri S. S. SHETTAR.—I plead my ignorance as to the form in which it should be moved. What is the exact form in which it should be moved?

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is too late a stage to make a suggestion in that behalf. The consideration of Clauses may be taken up now.

CLAUSES 2 to 5

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

“That clauses 2 to 5, both inclusive, stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2 to 5, both inclusive were added to the Bill.

CLAUSE 6

Mr. SPEAKER.—Certain points were raised by the hon'ble Member Sri Nagappa and they were supported by certain other hon. Members. The Hon'ble Minister in charge of the Bill has sent an amendment and it appears from his observations that such an amendment is not tenable. An amendment to delete a clause is out of order as it has the effect of a negative vote. The same object can be had by voting down the clause. After all, it is the opinion in the House that should prevail. There is no question of honour or d'honour in this. Our approach should be scientific and logical and not sentimental. The Minister in charge would probably desire the clause to be voted down. Whether to withhold a particular provision or to suspend it is the privilege and right of

(MR. SPEAKER)

the House and not of the Speaker. As I have understood the rules, it only means that while putting the clauses to the House for consideration and adoption, for the sake of convenience a particular clause can be held back and taken up at a convenient stage. The hon. Member Sri Siddaveerappa and others may look into the rule which gives various alternatives. Rule 88 says :

“The consideration of the schedule or schedules, if any, shall follow the consideration of clauses.....”

Various alternatives are given as to how the clauses are to be presented for the consideration of the House and how they are to be adopted. Under rule 87, I do not think the Speaker has any authority to keep any provision in abeyance ; it is for the House to do it and if the House wants to do it, I have no objection.

Sri K. H. RANGANATH.—I request the House to authorise the Speaker to postpone that particular clause. Otherwise it will lead to a very anomalous position, in the sense that tomorrow my Learned Friend Sri Nagappa will come and say, “You have voted it down and therefore no question of reconsideration arises.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—I think that position may not arise.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I do not see what prevents this House from keeping the question open. It will not be taken as though the whole thing has been given a go-by. I do not wish to speak harsh words against the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs who seems to be leaning towards the Opposition. One way is to throw out the clause now and take it up again by means of another motion. I feel that the House may not have any objection to give you permission under rule 87. To meet a situation like this that rule has been advisedly put in.

6-30 P.M.

Sri L. SRIKANTAI AH.—I agree with my hon'ble friend Sri Siddaveerappa. If the Speaker does not exercise the power vested under rule 87—now that the wind is blowing in that direction—the difficulty is how to interpret rule 87.

Sri S. V. AGNIHOTRI.—Sri Siddaveerappa will consider it when he becomes the Leader of the Opposition !

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—We will consider it when you come on this side.

Sri L. SRIKANTAI AH.—Rule 87 does not prevent the Speaker from exercising the power which is given to him under that rule. There is no other way of overcoming the difficulty.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Sir, Sri Siddaveerappa said that the question should be kept open. I have made it abundantly clear that the question would be kept open, not only the question but my mind and the mind of the Ruling Party is also kept open. I am sure there is no other Hon'ble Member on the other side who would question our bona fides. Rule 87 was referred to. What is the effect of postponing consideration of Clause 6 under Rule 87? If the consideration of Clause 6 is postponed, the Bill is not going to be passed and it would remain in that stage itself. I cannot take this to the Upper House. When this Hon'ble House has not expressed its opinion on Clause 6, how can I take it to the Upper House? I do not think it is the intention of any Hon'ble Member in this House that the other clauses of the Bill should be deleted. Under the circumstances, may I make an earnest appeal to the Members of the Opposition not to press this point? I am giving an assurance that not only this question, but our mind is also kept open on this issue.

Mr. SPEAKER.—With regard to this point, I have come to the conclusion that a mere rule of procedure does not give power to the Speaker to hold-over or postpone anything. The Chair does not want to claim that power. Even if the House were to give it, it will be wrong and unconstitutional. There is no such power given to the Speaker under the Constitution to postpone consideration of a particular clause. Rule 87 is only a rule of convenience to adjust the order in which the clauses are to be put to the vote of the House. Therefore, that procedure has to be followed. Hon'ble Member Sri Siddaveerappa said that Sri Nagappa might like to reconsider again the clause which is voted down. I think, that fear does not appear to be well-based. When this decision of voting down a particular provision is taken against a particular background which has been explained not only by the Treasury Benches but also by Hon'ble Members on the other Side. There is no question of any difficulty or misunderstanding arising in future. I shall put the Clause to the vote of the House, and it is for the House to adopt it, reject it or oppose it.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—Sir, I want to explain the position of Rule 87. These rules have been framed under the powers vested in this House under Article 208 of the Constitution. How the procedural wrangle should be resolved has been laid down under this. Under these circumstances only when the Treasury Benches after bringing in a certain Bill intends it to be voted down, it is something else, or if they are very curious and open-minded, then it is not for them to say that the Speaker should not exercise that power.

Mr. SPEAKER.—They are not telling me anything. I do not think I have got that power.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—Let the Bill be there. If a Committee is constituted it can submit its report very early and it can be disposed of. Under these circumstances, it is unfair for the Minister for

(SRI M. NAGAPPA)

Parliamentary Affairs to say that just because the Bill will be there as it is, the Speaker has no powers to exercise under Rule 87. These rules have got the force of law because they have been framed under Article 208 of the Constitution. The Speaker has got every right to postpone consideration of a certain clause of the Bill under Rule 87. The Hon'ble Speaker cannot belittle the powers vested under the Rules of Procedure.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is a definite procedure laid down for passing of laws. It is only by following the provisions of the Constitution, under which laws are to be enacted by this House, that they become law. Here the Rules of Procedure cannot be taken to be a law. I take the view that this procedure is only for the internal discipline of this House. They have no force of law. The citizens are not bound by this and therefore, these rules cannot have the force of law, just as the enactments passed by this House in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—Sir, I am not challenging the Ruling. But, I am submitting to the Chair that there is a Ruling of the Supreme Court of India in 1959 where they have held that the Rules of Procedure have got the force of law as laid down under the Constitution.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I hold that they have the force of law. But.....

Sri S. S. SHETTAR.—Article 197 says that if the Bill is rejected by the Council, the Legislative Assembly may, subject to the rules regulating its procedure ...

Mr. SPEAKER.—That means it is only the regulatory procedure. So far as the procedural part is concerned, it cannot give authority or right to the Speaker either to suspend or postpone. It is for the House to do whatever it likes. I put the clause to the vote of the House.

Sri S. S. SHETTAR.—Sir, I rise to a Point of Order.

Mr. SPEAKER.—No Point of Order can be raised when the Speaker has given the Ruling.

The question is :

“ That clause 6 stand part of the Bill. ”

The motion was negatived.

The clause 6 was deleted from the Bill.

CLAUSES 7 AND 8

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

“ That Clauses 7 and 8 stand part of the Bill. ”

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 7 and 8 were added to the Bill.

CLAUSE 1, ETC.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

“ That Clause 1, the Title and the Preamble stand part of the Bill. ”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, the Title and the Preamble were added to the Bill.

Motion to Pass

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Sir, I beg to move :

“ That the Mysore Legislature Salaries (Amendment) Bill, 1968, as amended be passed. ”

Sri S. S. SHETTAR.—Sir, it is already 6-30 P. M. The time of the Assembly is over. The time will have to be extended, otherwise the Bill cannot be put to vote.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Yes. Since the time fixed is over, I am extending the sitting from 6 P. M. to 7 P. M.

The question is :

“ That the Mysore Legislature Salaries (Amendment) Bill, 1968, as amended be passed. ”

The motion was adopted.

The House stands adjourned to meet again at 1 P. M. tomorrow.

The House adjourned at Forty-five Minutes past Six of the Clock to meet again at One of the Clock on Friday, the 13th September 1968.
